

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13 and 18 have been amended. No new matter is introduced.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) claims 1-20 as being anticipated by Koseki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,732,124 (hereinafter "*Koseki*").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants submit that *Koseki* does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest, at least, requesting that the log entry information be written to a log file, whereby the consumer surrenders control of the log entry, pausing execution of the event; and releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file, as recited, among other features, in independent claims 1 and 12.

*Koseki* relates to a data processing system with mechanism for restoring file systems based on transaction logs. *Koseki* discloses a data processing system having a logging mechanism which stores log records for repairing a file system when its consistency is lost. When there is a transaction attempting to update metadata stored in metadata volumes, a metadata loading unit reads the requested metadata objects out of the volumes and loads them to a metadata cache. At that time, a metadata manager updates its internal database to record from which metadata volume each metadata object has been fetched. Each time the transaction updates a metadata object in the cache, a log collection unit collects a copy of the updated metadata object, together with a volume ID which indicates its home metadata volume. The collected data is temporarily stored in a log buffer, and finally saved into a log volume by a log writing unit. *See Abstract.*

However, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest, responsive to a request that the log entry information be written to a log file, “pausing execution of the event; and releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information,” as claimed (emphasis added). As seen from the above, *Koseki* relates to a logging mechanism which stores log records for repairing a file system when its consistency is lost. However, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest at least releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least the reasons described above.

In addition, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest “cloning the log entry, wherein the log entry clone is a copy of an entire log entry that comprises the log entry information,” as recited, among other features, in independent claim 1 and claim 13 (depending from independent claim 12).

In col. 10, lines 24-32, *Koseki* states that “the data processing system is designed to prevent a transaction from reserving a metadata object that has just been released by another transaction. Briefly, this feature is accomplished by: (1) partly duplicating metadata allocation management data to permit a transaction to reserve metadata only within the scope of the duplicated management data...” (emphasis added). However, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest cloning the log entry, the log entry clone being a copy of an entire log entry, as claimed.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and dependent claim 13 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for these additional reasons.

With respect to independent claim 17, Applicants submit that the applied art does not disclose or suggest a multiple-threaded log manager, wherein the log manager, independently and separately from other processes, logs events, by:

receiving the log entry from the consumer, thereby obtaining control of the log entry and pausing execution of the event; and, releasing control of the log entry to the consumer, so that execution of the event can resume, prior to writing the log entry information to the log file,

as recited, among other features, in independent claim 17. As described above, *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 17. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is in condition for allowance over the applied art.

With respect to dependent claim 18, Applicants submit that *Koseki* does not disclose or suggest "the log manager cloning the log entry, wherein the log entry clone is a copy of an entire log entry that comprises the log entry information," as recited in dependent claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 18 is patentable over the applied art, and is in condition for allowance, for these additional reasons.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1, claims 13-16 depend from independent claim 12, and claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 17. Therefore, claims 2-11, 13-16 and 18-20 are allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to the claims from which they depend, and for the additional features recited therein.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe that the rejection against this application has been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 50-1078.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: **December 13, 2004**

Sean S. Wooden, Reg. No. 43,997  
**ANDREWS KURTH LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 662-2700  
Fax: (202) 662-2739